

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 and 24-27 are currently pending in the present application; Claims 1-20 are amended to remove improper multiple dependencies and to better comply with US patent prosecution practice; Claims 21-23 are cancelled; and Claims 24-27 are added to cover the claimed subject matter with an alternate scope. Support for the amendments and new claims is found at least in the originally filed Claims 1-23 and the originally filed specification at least at page 9 to page 19.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 4-20 and 22 were objected to for improper form as having multiple depending claims depending from other multiple depending claims; and Claims 1-3, 21, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Dudley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,754, herein "Dudley").

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of a personal interview with the Examiner and his supervisor on November 29, 2005. During the interview, differences between the present invention and references in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. The interview concluded with the Examiners acknowledging that Dudley does not disclose or suggest Applicants claimed bitmap block. Comments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

In response to the objection of Claims 4-20 and 22 for having improper form, Claims 4-20 and 22 are amended to remove the improper form. Accordingly, the grounds for objection to Claims 4-20 and 22 are believed to have been overcome.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-3, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Dudley, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons stated during the interview and reiterated below. Claim 1 recites, in part, a method comprising said

feedback message including a bitmap block associated with a predetermined number of packets having said associated identifiers, so as to inform said transmitter of a state of acknowledgement which includes at least one of an acknowledged state or an unacknowledged state of at least a plurality of said packets.

The outstanding Office Action finds that Dudley teaches a bitmap block.¹ Specifically the Office Action asserts that element 70 of Dudley discloses the bitmap block. However, Figure 3 shows element 70 as describing a receiver sequence number.² Furthermore the outstanding Office Action asserts that element 68 of Figure 1 also teaches the bitmap block.³ However, element 68 of Dudley describes control information as shown in Figure 3 and column 7, lines 30-38. As acknowledged during the interview, neither the control field nor the sequence number of Dudley is a bitmap block.

Claim 1 defines the bitmap block as being associated with a predetermined number of packets having consecutive identifiers so as to inform said transmitter of a state of acknowledgement which includes at least one of an acknowledged state or an unacknowledged state of each of said packets associated with said bitmap block.⁴

Because Dudley does not describe, teach or suggest a bitmap block as described in Claim 1, Dudley fails to disclose every feature recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Independent Claims 24-27 also include this feature.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 24-27 and the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 21 and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Dudley be withdrawn.

¹ Office Action dated November 1, 2005, page 4, line 15.

² Dudley, Figure 3, col. 7, lines 39-46.

³ Office Action dated November 1, 2005, page 4, lines 19-20.

⁴ Specification, page 4, lines 17-20.

Claim 2 further limits the method of Claim 1, activating said timer, when said transmitter sends to said receiver the first of said packets. Contrary to the Official Action and as acknowledged during the interview, Dudley does not teach this feature. Rather, Dudley has its STATUS_REQ timer start after the last packet is transmitted.⁵ This is the opposite of the feature recited in Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the rejection of Claim 2 and claims with similar features and claims dependent therefrom.

Finally, Applicants would like to indicate another feature of Claim 1 which further distinguishes Dudley. Claim 1 recites "associating a timer with said bitmap block." Because Dudley does not teach the bitmap block, Dudley does not disclose the combination of a timer associated with a bitmap block. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this is a further reason that Claim 1, other independent claims with this feature, Claims 24-27, and claims dependent therefrom are allowable.

Consequently, in view of the foregoing discussion and present amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

I:\ATTY\MS\21s\216566US\216566US AMENDMENT FINAL.DOC

⁵ Dudley, col. 15, lines 50-58.